



State of Wisconsin
Department of Public Instruction
Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent

*****NEWS RELEASE*****

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

DPI 2005-89

Tuesday, June 14, 2005

CONTACT: Joseph Donovan, Communications Officer, (608) 266-3559

Preliminary progress report issued for schools

MADISON—The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has sent preliminary notification to public schools and school districts of their status under state and federal accountability requirements.

For the 2004-05 school year, 98 percent of schools and all but one of 426 districts met annual measurable objectives that make up the adequate yearly progress (AYP) review, and 45 schools and one district received preliminary notice that they have been identified for improvement for missing the same AYP indicator for two or more consecutive years.

Federal education law requires that the DPI notify schools and school districts annually of their progress toward achieving proficiency for all students in reading and mathematics by 2014. The information is intended to assist district and school staff members in identifying areas of strength and to highlight areas that may need to be addressed to help all students achieve proficiency.

To prepare annual progress reports for each Wisconsin public school and school district, the DPI uses a federally approved formula to review four federal objectives: test participation, graduation rates for high schools and districts graduating 12th-graders or school attendance rates for elementary and middle schools, and achievement rates in reading and mathematics. Preliminary data show that 51 schools and one school district were notified that they missed one or more AYP indicator for the 2004-05 school year. Schools and districts have until June 30 to correct any data errors in the preliminary progress report. There are no Title I sanctions associated with missing AYP for one year.

Specific indicators for 2004-05 require schools and districts to have

- at least 95 percent of their enrolled students participate in statewide reading and math assessments, which includes the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) and Wisconsin Alternate Assessments (WAA) for Students with Disabilities and Limited-English Proficient students;
- attendance rates of at least 85 percent and graduation rates of 82 percent, or show growth from the prior year on these indicators;

(more)

- at least 67.5 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced on the state reading tests and 47.5 percent scoring proficient or advanced on math tests; and
- AYP indicators apply to all students and to subgroups of students (of adequate size) identified by racial/ethnic groups and English proficiency, disability, and poverty status.

Schools that missed the same performance indicator for two consecutive years were identified for improvement, and, if they receive federal Title I funding, are subject to sanctions under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Sanctions, which escalate based on the number of years a school is identified for improvement, include allowing parents to send their children to a higher performing school in the district, providing tutoring services to eligible socio-economically disadvantaged students, writing and implementing a school improvement plan, or restructuring the school.

For 2004-05, 45 schools and one district received preliminary notification that they were identified for improvement. Nine schools that were identified for improvement last year left the list, three closed, and six schools were newly identified. Of those receiving preliminary notice this year, 19 made AYP for 2004-05 and if they make AYP again in 2005-06, they will no longer be identified for improvement.

Because the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as NCLB, includes high stakes accountability among its provisions, the department sought and received approval to apply a confidence interval when evaluating school proficiency rates to reduce misclassification error. The DPI also worked with the U.S. Department of Education and the state's congressional delegation to use other federal flexibility guidelines to refine Wisconsin's formula for evaluating schools to ensure a greater level of fairness and to avoid over-identifying schools for improvement.

"We are working at the federal level and with Wisconsin administrators, teachers, board members, and other school staff members to ensure a quality education for every child and to close the achievement gap between students of color, economically disadvantaged students, and their peers," said State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster.

###

NOTES: An explanation of adequate yearly progress and provisions of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act follows. Further information on the criteria used to determine adequate yearly progress is available at < <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/oea/annrww05.html> >.

Schools and school districts have until 4 p.m. June 30 to correct data errors that affect their AYP or identified for improvement status. Preliminary lists of schools and districts missing adequate yearly progress and schools and districts identified for improvement are available at < <http://www2.dpi.state.wi.us/sifi/default.asp> >.



State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent

An AYP Primer

Adequate yearly progress (AYP) is one provision in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), first enacted in 1965 and reauthorized in 2001 as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The act encompasses 45 federal programs that distribute approximately \$22 billion in education funding in 2004-05 to the states. All school districts in Wisconsin receive some federal funding under ESEA.

NCLB Requirements

Title I, which recognizes the historical link between poverty and low achievement, is the largest of the ESEA programs. School districts receive Title I funding based on the number of children ages 5-17 living in poverty and target funding to their neediest schools. Of the state's 2,202 schools, 1,126 are sharing \$160.6 million in 2004-05 federal Title I funding to supplement educational opportunities for children who live in high poverty areas: 805 for targeted assistance and 321 as school-wide schools.

Because the state receives and distributes Title I funds, it is subject to Title I requirements. AYP is one of the requirements of the Title I accountability system. State-level Title I requirements are

- Implement a statewide accountability system that ensures all students will be proficient or better in reading and math by 2013-14.
- Test all students in reading and math in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and once in high school by 2005-06. Test students in science at least once in grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.
- Establish AYP targets (see table below) that all schools and districts must reach each year.
- Measure and report on the progress of all students and for student groups based on racial/ethnic groups and English proficiency, disability, and income status.
- Identify schools that did not make AYP for all students or any subgroup of students for two or more consecutive years.
- Require all teachers teaching "core academic subjects" to be highly qualified. Core academic subjects under ESEA means English, reading or language arts, math, science, foreign language, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography.
- Develop a state report card with specific reporting elements prescribed in the law.

How Does AYP Work

Under federal education law, all Wisconsin school districts and individual schools within each district must meet the state's four AYP objectives each year. The first two objectives, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized tests in reading and math, have proficiency targets that move progressively from the starting point to 100 percent proficient by 2014. The U.S. Department of Education approved Wisconsin's progressive targets for reading and math proficiency because the early years will be spent implementing state and local support efforts to improve student achievement.

Adequate Yearly Progress			
		Proficient or Advanced	
		Reading	Math
Starting Point	2001-02	61.0%	37.0%
	2002-03	61.0%	37.0%
	2003-04	61.0%	37.0%
Intermediate Goal (New tests begin)	2004-05	67.5%	47.5%
	2005-06	67.5%	47.5%
Intermediate Goal	2006-07	67.5%	47.5%
	2007-08	74.0%	58.0%
	2008-09	74.0%	58.0%
Intermediate Goal	2009-10	74.0%	58.0%
	2010-11	80.5%	68.5%
	2011-12	87.0%	79.0%
Intermediate Goal	2012-13	93.5%	89.5%
Final Goal	2013-14	100.0%	100.0%

In addition to reading and math proficiency on statewide tests (67.5 percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in reading and 47.5 percent proficient or advanced in math for 2004-05), the other AYP objectives in the annual review expect schools and districts to have

- 95 percent of their enrolled students participate in statewide reading and math assessments, which includes Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) and Wisconsin Alternate Assessments for Students with Disabilities and Limited-English Proficient students.
- attendance rates of at least 85 percent and a graduation rate of 82 percent, or show growth from the prior year on these indicators.

The four AYP objectives apply to all students as well as to subgroups of students of an adequate size. Schools that miss the same AYP target for one or more student groups for two consecutive years are identified for improvement and face federal sanctions if they receive Title I funds.

Wisconsin's accountability plan has additional "safe harbor" provisions for schools that do not meet the reading or math target. Those provisions require that schools reduce the number of students scoring basic or minimal on reading and math tests by 10 percent *and* reach the target for the other academic indicator.

Refining and Applying the AYP Formula

Because the NCLB includes high stakes accountability for schools, districts, and the state, the Department of Public Instruction continues to work with the federal education department to use new flexibility guidelines to refine Wisconsin's formula for evaluating schools to maximize consistency around AYP decisions and minimize the potential for errors in determining if a school or district made AYP. For the 2004-05 review, the DPI applied statistically valid calculations to ensure a greater level of fairness and to avoid misidentification of schools with small numbers of tested students. Additionally, student proficiency was based on the achievement of students enrolled for the full academic year (FAY), and district accountability was divided into grade spans. Beginning in 2004-05, a district must miss the same AYP target across elementary, middle, and high school for two consecutive years to be found in need of improvement. (Calculation procedures used on test data for accountability decisions differ from those used for general public reporting purposes such as the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS).)

Although only schools receiving Title I funding are subject to ESEA sanctions, all schools identified for improvement will have access to consultation and technical assistance to improve student achievement. Schools receiving Title I funds are subject to sanctions that range from writing and implementing a school improvement plan to restructuring of the school.

The first year a school is identified for improvement (two years of missing AYP on the same indicator) it must begin a school improvement process that includes writing a school improvement plan. In addition, a Title I first year school must offer parents the opportunity to send their child to another higher-performing school in the district. In the second year a Title I school is identified for improvement, the school must offer public school choice and supplemental services, such as after-school tutoring for eligible socio-economically disadvantaged students or other programming to improve student achievement. In the third and subsequent years, schools are subject to various corrective actions specified by NCLB. (A description of Levels of Accountability is available on the DPI website at < <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea/doc/sifilevels.doc> >.)

Additional ESEA/NCLB Resources

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

No Child Left Behind - Implementation of the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act in Wisconsin — <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/index.html> (see: Accountability/AYP topics)

Office of Educational Accountability — <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/oea/index.html>

Wisconsin Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report and Districts/Schools Identified for Improvement — <http://www2.dpi.state.wi.us/sifi>

Wisconsin's School Accountability System — http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/oea/acct_sch.html (see: Criteria used in Annual Review of School Performance)

Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) — <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/sig/index.html>

U. S. Department of Education — <http://www.ed.gov>